



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,579	04/22/2004	Mazen Faraj	CA920030072US1	6716
61136 7590 01/24/2008 HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP IBM RSW P.O. BOX 203518 AUSTIN, TX 78720			EXAMINER BIBBEE, JARED M	
			ART UNIT 2161	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 01/24/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@hamiltontertile.com  
seaton@hamiltontertile.com  
tmunoz@hamiltontertile.com

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/829,579

Applicant(s)

FARAJ, MAZEN

Examiner

Jared M. Bibbee

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/25/2007.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. This Office Action has been issued in response to the pre-appeal decision filed on 8 November 2007. Claims 1-20 are pending. This action has been made NON-FINAL.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 9-12, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fleeson (US 6,353,846 B1).

With respect to independent claim 1, Fleeson clearly teaches in a team sharing environment, an integrated development environment for persisting resource properties during transitions of data between a user and a team repository (*see column 3, lines 26-48; Note that a plurality of resource modules, each providing a component function for implementing a portion of the functional unit and having a set of properties associated therewith. A link object defines a set of required modules having required properties. The various modules must be stored somewhere such as a repository in order for the resource management processor to access the modules per a user request.*), the integrated development environment comprising:

- a property file for storing property keys and their associated resource property values (*see column 8, lines 63 through column 9, line 15 and Fig 4; Note the property keys are the items listed under property name and the property values is the data that resides under*

*the value column.*), the property file being accessible by a user for persisting resource properties during transitions of data (*see column 9, lines 16-22*).

With respect to dependent claim 2, note the discussion of claim 1 above, Fleeson discloses all of the elements of claim 1 and further teaches the limitation of an associated property file is created for each resource having properties to be persisted (*see column 8, lines 51-54*).

With respect to dependent claim 3, note the discussion of claim 1 above, Fleeson discloses all of the elements of claim 1 and further teaches the limitation of the property file is further used for storing a cache of prior resource property values (*see column 8, lines 63 through column 9, line 22*).

With respect to dependent claim 4, note the discussion of claim 1 above, Fleeson discloses all of the elements of claim 1 and further teaches the limitation of the property file is searchable for returning a list of the property keys and their associated resource property values (*see column 8, lines 63 through column 9, line 22*).

With respect to independent claim 9, claim 9 is a method claim corresponding to environment claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 1 above.

With respect to dependent claim 10, note the discussion of claim 9 above, Fleeson discloses all of the elements of claim 9 and further teaches the limitation of storing the property keys and values in different property files for different resources (*see column 8, lines 63 through column 9, line 22*).

With respect to claims 11-12, claims 11-12 are method claims corresponding to environment claims 3-4 and are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claims 3-4 above.

With respect to independent claim 15, claim 15 only differs from claim 1 in that it adds to the preamble the limitation of a computer program product having a physical computer readable medium tangibly embodying computer executable code. Fleeson clearly teaches a computer program product having a physical computer readable medium tangibly embodying computer executable code (*see column 7, lines 43-56*). As for the rest of claim 15, it corresponds to claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 1 above.

With respect to dependent claim 16, note the discussion of claim 15 above, Fleeson discloses all of the elements of claim 15 and further teaches the limitation of code storing the property keys and values in different property files for different resources (*see column 8, lines 63 through column 9, line 22*).

With respect to claims 17-18, claims 17-18 are computer program product claims corresponding to environment claims 3-4 and are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claims 3-4 above.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5-7, 13, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleeson in view of Warshavsky et al (US 6,732,095 B1).

With respect to dependent claim 5, note the discussion of claim 1 above, Fleeson discloses all of the elements of claim 1 but fails to explicitly teach the limitation of a property key name is qualified by appending a property key name to the name of a contributing resource.

However, Warshavsky teaches the limitation of a property key name is qualified by appending a property key name to the name of a contributing resource (*see column 7, lines 1-32*).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Fleeson and Warshavsky before him or her, to modify the module and property interface of Fleeson to incorporate the XML tag name creation of Warshavsky for the purpose of making the interface of Fleeson web based.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow data to be transferred over the web (*see column 1, lines 35-43*).

With respect to dependent claim 6, note the discussion of claim 1 above, Warshavsky further teaches the limitation of the property file is a metadata file (*see column 7, lines 49-58; Note that the XML Mapping Definitions are stored in a repository indicating that the definitions are metadata.*).

With respect to dependent claim 7, note the discussion of claim 6 above, Warshavsky discloses all of the elements of claim 6 and further teaches the limitation of the metadata file is an XML file (*see column 8, lines 30-37*).

With respect to claim 13, claim 13 are method claims corresponding to environment claim 5 and are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 5 above.

With respect to claim 19, claim 19 are computer program product claims corresponding to environment claim 5 and are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 5 above.

6. Claims 8, 14, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleeson in view of Bradley et al (U.S. 6,584,507 B1).

With respect to dependent claim 8, note the discussion of claim 1 above, Fleeson discloses all of the elements of claim 1, but fails to explicitly recite providing an extension point for providing an application program interface to third party plug-ins for creating a property file for the third party plug-in. However, Bradley clearly teaches providing an extension point for providing an application program interface to third party plug-ins for creating a property file for the third party plug-in (*see column 10, lines 25-67 through column 12, lines 1-15*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the module and property relational interface as taught by Fleeson to incorporate the ability to add additional resources as taught by Bradley for the purpose of allowing users to add third-party applications to a network of already established applications. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the module and property relational interface as taught by Fleeson to incorporate the ability to add additional resources as taught by Bradley for the purpose of minimizing engineering and support effort required to integrate applications and make them operate together (*see column 5, lines 53-67*).

With respect to independent claim 14, claim 14 is a method claim corresponding to environment claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 8 above.

With respect to independent claim 20, claim 20 is a computer program product claim corresponding to environment claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 8 above.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jared M. Bibbee whose telephone number is 571-270-1054. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Application/Control Number:  
10/829,579  
Art Unit: 2161

Page 8

JMB 



**SAM RIMELL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**